UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,579	04/22/2004	Mazen Faraj	CA920030072US1	6716

61136 7590 08/12/2008

HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP
IBM RSW
P.O. BOX 203518
AUSTIN, TX 78720

EXAMINER	
BIBBEE, JARED M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/12/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@hamiltonterrile.com
seaton@hamiltonterrile.com
tmunoz@hamiltonterrile.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/829,579	FARAJ, MAZEN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JARED M. BIBBEE	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 April 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *9* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *9* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action has been issued in response to amendment filed on 23 April 2008. Claims 1-8 and 10-20 are cancelled. Claim 9 is pending. Applicants' arguments have been carefully and respectfully considered in light of the instant amendment and are not persuasive, with respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 as will be discussed below. Applicant's amendment has necessitated a new grounds of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103. Accordingly, this action has been made FINAL.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informality: Only third party plug-ins has antecedent basis, third party plug-in does not. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleeson (US 6,353,846 B1) in view of Warshavsky et al (US 6,732,095 B1), and further in view of Bradley et al (U.S. 6,584,507 B1).

With respect to independent claim 9, Fleeson clearly teaches for a team-sharing environment, a method for persisting resource properties in an integrated development environment during transitions of data between a user and a team repository *(see column 3, lines 26-48; Note that a plurality of resource modules, each providing a component function for implementing a portion of the functional unit and having a set of properties associated therewith. A link object defines a set of required modules having required properties. The various modules must be stored somewhere such a as a repository in order for the resource management processor to access the modules per a user request.)*, the method comprising the steps of:

- storing, in a property file of the integrated development environment, a list of property keys and their associated resource property values *(see column 8, lines 63 through column 9, line 15 and Fig 4; Note the property keys are the items listed under property name and the property values is the data that resides under the value column.)*, the property file being accessible by a user for persisting resource properties during transitions of data *(see column 9, lines 16-22)*;
- storing the property keys and values in different property files for different resources *(see column 8, lines 63 through column 9, line 22)*;
- storing in the property file a cache of prior resource property values *(see column 8, lines 63 through column 9, line 22)*;

- searching the property file for returning a list of the property keys and their associated resource property values *(see column 8, lines 63 through column 9, line 22)*.

Fleeson fails to explicitly teach the limitation of qualifying a property key name by appending a property key name to the name of a contributing resource.

However, Warshavsky teaches the limitation of qualifying a property key name by appending a property key name to the name of a contributing resource *(see column 7, lines 1-32)*.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Fleeson and Warshavsky before him or her, to modify the module and property interface of Fleeson to incorporate the XML tag name creation of Warshavsky for the purpose of making the interface of Fleeson web based.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow data to be transferred over the web *(see column 1, lines 35-43)*.

The combination of Fleeson and Warshavsky fail to explicitly teach the limitation of providing an extension point for providing an application program interface to third party plug-ins for creating a property file for the third party plug-in.

However, Bradley clearly teaches providing an extension point for providing an application program interface to third party plug-ins for creating a property file for the third party plug-in *(see column 10, lines 25-67 through column 12, lines 1-15)*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Fleeson and Warshavsky to incorporate the ability to add additional

resources as taught by Bradley for the purpose of allowing users to add third-party applications to a network of already established applications.

The skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the teachings of Fleeson and Warshavsky to incorporate the ability to add additional resources as taught by Bradley for the purpose of minimizing engineering and support effort required to integrate applications and make them operate together *(see column 5, lines 53-67)*.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicants' arguments with respect to objections and rejections not repeated herein are moot, as the respective objections and rejections have been withdrawn in light of the instant amendments. Those arguments that still deemed relevant are now addressed below.

A. Applicant Argues:

When discussing the element of a property file for storing property keys and their associated resource property values, the Examiner sets forth:

> With respect to independent claim 1, Warshavsky clearly teaches in a team sharing environment, an integrated development environment for persisting resource properties during transitions of data between a user and a team repository (see column 4, lines 38-56), the integrated development environment comprising: a property file for storing property keys and their associated resource property values (see column 5, lines 4-30 and Tables 1-3; Note the property keys are the items listed under property name in Table 1-3 and the property values is the data that resides in those fields.). (Office action dated January 11, 2007, page 5.)
> .
> .
> .

However, nowhere in this portion of Warshavsky, nor anywhere else in Warshavsky is there any disclosure or suggestion of an integrated development environment, much less an integrated development environment which comprises a property file for storing property keys and their associated resource property values as disclosed and claimed. These deficiencies of Warshavsky are not cured by Fleeson.

Response:

With respect to Applicant's argument, the argument is not correct and Examiner is not persuaded because Applicant is arguing a cancelled claim and secondly Applicant's arguments

are centered around prior art (Warshavsky) which is not the center of the rejection set forth in the office action filed on 1/24/2008. Examiner based his rejection off of Fleeson regarding the limitations "an integrated development environment and a property file for storing property keys and their associated resource property values". Therefore, Applicant's argument is invalid and moot. Examiner maintains the following regarding the above limitations:

With respect to independent claim 9, Fleeson clearly teaches for a team-sharing environment, a method for persisting resource properties in an integrated development environment during transitions of data between a user and a team repository *(see column 3, lines 26-48; Note that a plurality of resource modules, each providing a component function for implementing a portion of the functional unit and having a set of properties associated therewith. A link object defines a set of required modules having required properties. The various modules must be stored somewhere such a as a repository in order for the resource management processor to access the modules per a user request.)*, the method comprising the steps of:

- storing, in a property file of the integrated development environment, a list of property keys and their associated resource property values *(see column 8, lines 63 through column 9, line 15 and Fig 4; Note the property keys are the items listed under property name and the property values is the data that resides under the value column.)*, the property file being accessible by a user for persisting resource properties during transitions of data *(see column 9, lines 16-22)*.

B. Applicant Argues:

However, none of these portions of Bradley discloses or suggests where the environment further comprises an extension point for providing an application program interface to third party plug-ins for creating a property file for the third party plug-in as set forth in claims 9.

Response:

With respect to Applicant's argument, the argument is not correct and Examiner is not persuaded because Bradley clearly teaches providing an extension point for providing an application program interface to third party plug-ins for creating a property file for the third party plug-in *(see column 10, lines 25-67 through column 12, lines 1-15; Note that the user can use a connection file, which consists of many properties such as application name and version, to provide a management system access to various third party applications.)*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Fleeson and Warshavsky to incorporate the ability to add additional resources as taught by Bradley for the purpose of allowing users to add third-party applications to a network of already established applications.

The skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the teachings of Fleeson and Warshavsky to incorporate the ability to add additional resources as taught by Bradley for the purpose of minimizing engineering and support effort required to integrate applications and make them operate together *(see column 5, lines 53-67)*.

C. Applicant Argues:

More specifically, Fleeson, Warshavsky and Bradley, take alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method for persisting resource properties in an integrated development environment during transitions of data between a user and a team repository for a team-sharing environment, much less such a method that includes storing, in a property file of the integrated development environment, a list of property keys to be persisted and their associated resource property values, the property file being accessible by a user for persisting resource properties during transitions of data, storing the property keys and values in different property files for different resources, storing in the property file a cache of prior resource property values, searching the property file for returning a list of the property keys and their associated resource property values, qualifying a property key name by appending the property key name to a contributing resource's name, and, providing an extension point as an application program interface to third party plug-ins for creating a property file for the third party plug-in, all as required by claim 9. Accordingly, claim 9 is allowable over Fleeson, Warshavsky, and Bradley.

Response:

With respect to Applicant's argument, the argument is not correct and Examiner is not persuaded because Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JARED M. BIBBEE whose telephone number is (571)270-1054. The examiner can normally be reached on IFP.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. M. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2161

/B. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2161

***

/Apu M Mofiz/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161